

### REMARKS

Claims 1 - 34 are pending in the application, wherein claims 27 – 34 are newly added.

On 7 FEB 2006, Applicants conducted a first part of teleconference with Examiners Kramskaya and Deb, and on 9 FEB 2006, Applicants and the Examiners concluded the teleconference. Applicants thank the Examiners for making time for the teleconference.

In the Office Action:

- (a) several claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,168,261 to Weeks (hereinafter "the Weeks patent");
- (b) several claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Weeks patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,168 to Baker (hereinafter "the Baker patent"); and
- (c) one claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Weeks patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,209 to Lavoie et al. (hereinafter "the Lavoie et al. patent").

Of the rejected claims, six claims are independent, namely claims 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 26. Each of these independent claims includes either (a) a recital that an analog signal simulates a power line signal, or (b) a recital similar thereto.

During the aforementioned teleconference, the Examiners agreed that the Weeks patent does not disclose that an analog signal simulates a power line signal. Whereas the Weeks patent does not disclose that an analog signal simulates a power line signal, (a) the Weeks patent does not anticipate any of claims 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 26, and (b) the cited combinations of the Weeks and Baker patents and the Weeks and Lavoie et al. patents do not render unpatentable any of claims 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 26. Thus, all of claims 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 26 are both novel and patentable over the Weeks, Baker and Lavoie et al patents, regardless of whether these patents are considered independently or in combination with one another. Claims that depend from any of claims 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 or 26, are also novel and patentable over the Weeks, Baker and Lavoie et al patents.

In view of the foregoing assessment of the cited references, the Examiners also agreed to withdraw the rejections and the finality of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 102(b) and 103(a) rejections.

The application, as filed, shows and describes breaker status signals 161 and 161<sub>N</sub>. Applicants determined that breaker status signals 161 and 161<sub>N</sub> are superfluous. Accordingly, Applicants are amending the specification and FIG. 1 to delete breaker status signals 161 and 161<sub>N</sub>.


Applicants are (a) amending claims 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 26 to clarify a nature of information being indicated by data, and (b) amending claims 9 and 21 for consistency with their respective underlying independent claims. Also, Applicants are adding claims 27 – 34 to further provide the claim coverage that Applicants appear to deserve based on the prior art that was cited by the Examiner. Although the present amendment is being made after a final action, whereas the finality of the Office Action is being withdrawn, Applicants respectfully request that the Office enter the amendment.

Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

2/21/06



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: 203-327-4500  
Fax: 203-327-6401